

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action dated October 30, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 32 and 33 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims. Claims 1 and 26-33 are pending.

Claims 1 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims of the application and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 5767926) in view of Suzuki (US 6,256,082) and Prior Art Admitted by Applicant (PAAA). Applicants respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references, in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the auxiliary electrode line comprises a first auxiliary electrode line extending from the first gate lines to the pixel region in a direction parallel to the first data line and a second auxiliary electrode line extending from the second gate line to the pixel region in a direction parallel to the second data line".

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of claim 1.

In addition, the storage capacitor is constituted by overlapping with the first electrode and the pixel electrode. Thus, the storage capacitor of Kim has good efficiency when the area of

the first electrode overlapping with the pixel electrode is large. A large overlapping area in Kim is essential. Kim excludes the small overlapping area basically. Thus, the feature of overlapping area in PAAA cannot be incorporated with that in Kim.

Based upon the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 32.

With respect to drawing objection, Applicant submits the slit is shown in the drawings and no drawing correction is needed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the drawing objection are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Suzuki and PAAA as applied to claims 1 and 32 in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,657,100, issued to Yamamoto et al. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Suzuki, PAAA and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,710,609, issued to Shimada. And, claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Suzuki and PAAA and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,859,681, issued to VanderPloeg et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants have discussed above how independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Applicants submit that Yamamoto, Shimada and VanderPloeg fail to remedy the deficient teachings of Kim, Suzuki and PAAA. As such, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 26-31 are allowable over any combination of Kim, Suzuki, PAAA, Yamamoto, Shimada, and VanerPloeg. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

For at least this reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 and claims 26-32, which depend on claim 1 variously, are allowable over the cited references.

In addition, Claim 33 is allowable over cited references, in that claim 33 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the auxiliary electrode line does not overlap with the pixel electrode".

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of claim 33.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant